

DISTRICT JUDGE'S MINUTES  
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF ARIZONA – TUCSON

U.S. District Judge: Cindy K. Jorgenson

Date: February 26, 2019

USA v. Jose Angel Felix-Ramirez, et al

Case Number: CR-17-02031-TUC-CKJ-BPV

Assistant U.S. Attorneys: Sarah Houston and Adam Rossi

Spanish interpreters for the defendants: Ignacio Barrientos and Carlos Arvizu

Court reporter: Erica McQuillen

Courtroom deputy: Sandra G. Fuller

Defendant 9: Jose Orlando Linares-Sanchez is present, in custody, and represented by Ruben Esparza (CJA).

Defendant 10: Douglas Mariaga-Munoz is present, in custody, and represented by Francisco Leon (CJA).

Defendant 11: Jose Lorenzo Osorto-Calix represented by David Valadez (CJA) is not present, having requested his presence be waived on February 25, 2019, and in custody.

**ORAL ARGUMENT ON MOTIONS TO SUPPRESS HEARING (DOC. 373) AND (DOC. 374)  
- CONTINUED FROM FEBRUARY 25, 2019:**

**2:39 p.m.:** The Court notes counsel and two defendants are present and ready to proceed.

Mr. Leon, counsel for defendant Douglas Mariago-Munoz (10), presents his argument regarding the Motion to Suppress Post-Arrest Statements for Miranda and Corley Violations (Doc. 373) to the Court.

The Court notes counsel for the remaining defendants have not joined in this motion, but the Court has offered Mr. Esparza, counsel for defendant Jose Orlando Linares-Sanchez (9), the opportunity to file his own motion to suppress with a deadline of March 5, 2019.

Counsel for the government, Adam Rossi, presents argument to the Court regarding the motion (Doc. 373).

The Court **DENIES** the motion (Doc. 373) for the reasons stated on the record.

Mr. Leon, counsel for the defendant, Douglas Mariago-Munoz (10), presents his argument regarding the Motion to Suppress Out-Of-Court and In-Court Identification Testimony (Doc. 374) to the Court.

Mr. Esparza, counsel for defendant Jose Orlando Linares-Sanchez (9), presents his argument having joined in the Motion to Suppress (Doc. 374).

USA v. Jose Angel Felix-Ramirez, et al

Date: February 26, 2019

Case Number: CR-17-02031-TUC-CKJ-BPV

Page 2 of 2

The Court informs the parties an *in camera* review of the unredacted version of exhibit 1 has been conducted. The Court **FINDS** the text messages are not relevant to the issues in dispute in this hearing. The Court does accept the redacted exhibit and **FINDS** disclosure to defense counsel of the other written material is not necessary nor relevant to this proceeding.

Counsel for the government, Sarah Houston, presents argument to the Court regarding the defendant's motion (Doc. 374).

The Court **DENIES** the motion (Doc. 374) for the reasons stated on the record.

The Court **ORDERS** the government's Memorandum for *In Camera* Review of Agent Text Messages be filed under seal and *ex parte* to allow a record of the redacted version. The Court again **FINDS** these text messages are not relevant to today's proceeding.

Oral Argument on Motion to Suppress Hearing: 2:39 p.m. to 3:56 p.m. (1 hour and 17 minutes)